

MORNING 220,066  
SUNDAY 234,926

APR 7 1962

STATINTL

## Walker in Washington

MUCH OF WHAT former Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker has told the Senate subcommittee on muzzling needed saying, and we are glad that someone has had the guts to say it. Unfortunately, however, it is painfully apparent that Walker was not the man for the job. While there is a good deal of substance to the numerous charges he leveled against high-ranking officials of the State Department and other branches of the federal government, as well as the United Nations, and elements of the "liberal press," the charges were not properly documented.

In two days of testimony and questioning, Walker employed what can best be described, in military terms, as the "saturation bombing" technique. Such a technique often injures the innocent along with the guilty, and for that reason should be used only in the rarest of circumstances. This is not one of them.

In spite of the many important shreds of truth which Walker has now brought to light, he has damaged his own cause by failing to discriminate between treason and folly, and by making several statements he cannot prove.

Unfortunately, most of the truth will be ignored, while the errors will be remembered and used against him and all others who are allied with him in his crusade.

—★—

TO SAY that our foreign policy has not been tough enough and has at times assisted the enemy is almost an understatement. But to imply that some who have been responsible for foreign policy have been traitors is quite another matter.

If Walker can prove the later case, he should present adequate documentation.

Walker hit the nail on the head, we believe, in his charges against

Adam Yarmolinsky, one of Secretary McNamara's aides. Yarmolinsky does have a leftist record. Several years ago, in a study which he prepared for the far-left Fund for the Republic, Yarmolinsky advocated the abolition of the government's loyalty-security program.

Walker also made some valid and useful observations on other individuals and policies which have been responsible for our continued losses in the cold war. But why was he not satisfied to stop while he was ahead?

—★—

WHY, FOR INSTANCE, did he make the claim that Undersecretary of State Walt Whitman Rostow has been in control of the operating arm of the CIA since 1954, when the record seems to show that Rostow had no connection with the government until 1960?

And why did he attack the book, "What We Must Know About Communism," when he hadn't even read it?

These are errors for which there is little excuse.

Gen. Walker has done a great deal of good for the anticommunist cause. He has sacrificed much. And to a certain extent he has been a scapegoat. But all of this does not permit him to level serious charges without proof, or to attribute an evil motive to those who have made dangerous policy errors.

In the continuing battle against communism — and misguided liberalism — in this country, what we most need is understanding, documentation, precision and articulation. These qualities Gen. Walker has not always provided.

By failing to provide them, he has not only diluted the effect of the war against his enemies, but has disappointed some of his friends and confused the issues.

CPYRGHT